arXiv:1602.00530v1 [math.AP] 1 Feb 2016

STABILITY PROPERTIES AND LARGE TIME BEHAVIOR OF VISCOSITY SOLUTIONS OF HAMILTON-JACOBI EQUATIONS ON METRIC SPACES

ATSUSHI NAKAYASU AND TOKINAGA NAMBA

Abstract. We investigate asymptotic behaviors of a metric viscosity solution of a Hamilton-Jacobi equation defined on a general metric space in Gangbo-Święch sense. Our results include general stability and large time behavior of the solution.

1. Introduction

In this chapter we study stability of a solution of Hamilton-Jacobi equations on a general complete geodesic metric space space (X, d). Let H be a continuous function on $X \times \mathbf{R}_+$ called a *Hamiltonian*. Consider a Cauchy problem of a Hamilton-Jacobi equation of the form

$$\partial_t u + H(x, |Du|) = 0 \quad \text{in } (0,\infty) \times X, \tag{1.1}$$

$$u|_{t=0} = u_0 \tag{1.2}$$

with initial data u_0 and a corresponding stationary equation of the form

$$H(x, |Dv|) = c \quad \text{in } X \tag{1.3}$$

with some $c \in \mathbf{R}$.

The theory of Hamilton-Jacobi equations on generalized spaces have been developing in these years. For example, [17] and [3] study a stationary equations on topological networks and post-critically finite fractals including the Sierpinski gasket. In order to cover them a metric viscosity solution is posed, which means a theory of viscosity solutions on a general metric space. A notion of metric viscosity solution was first introduced by Giga-Hamamuki-Nakayasu [11] to the stationary equation (1.3) in a spirit of [17]. It was attempted to apply this idea to the evolutionary equation (1.2) in [15]. Afterwards some different notions of metric viscosity solutions were proposed by several authors; see, e.g., [1], [8] [9]. In particular, the metric viscosity solution by Gangbo-Święch [8], [9] is apparently compatible with stability argument. In fact, the authors of [8] construct a solution of (1.2) by Perron method while the other materials show a representation formula of a metric viscosity solution.

The main aim of the present work is to establish a general stability result for the Gangbo-Święch solutions. Roughly speaking, the stability is the proposition claiming that the semilimit of a family of viscosity solutions is a viscosity solution; see [2, Theorem A.2]. At least in the classical theory of viscosity solutions the stability is a fundamental property to derive some asymptotic behavior of the solution. Large time asymptotics of a viscosity solution of Hamilton-Jacobi equations is studied by

Date: February 2, 2016.

Namah-Roquejoffre [16] and Fathi [6] independently. Another aim of this chapter is to establish, as a consequence of the stability, a large time asymptotic behavior of the solution on a singular space such as the Sierpinski gasket. Based on the argument in [16] we will show that the solution $u(t,x)+ct$ of (1.2) goes to a function v as $t\to\infty$ and v is a solution of the stationary problem (1.3) with some constant $c\in\mathbf{R}$.

We restrict ourselves to the case when the metric space X is compact but the Sierpinski gasket can be handled. Let us extend H to $X\times\mathbf{R}$ as an even function $H(x,p)=H(x,|p|)$. The basic assumptions on the Hamiltonian are:

(A1) H is continuous.
(A2) H is convex in the second variable.
(A3) H is coercive in the sense of

$$\lim_{p\to\infty}\inf_x H(x,p)=\infty.$$

(A4) $\sup_x H(x,0)<\infty$.

Set $c:=\sup_x H(x,0)$; otherwise the stationary equation (1.3) has no solution. We first show that the stationary equation has at least one solution. Then, a standard barrier method implies that there exist upper and lower semilimits $\overline{u}(x)$ and $\underline{u}(x)$ of $u(t,x)+ct$ as $t\to\infty$ as real-valued functions. As a result the stability argument yields that $\overline{u}$ and $\underline{u}$ are a subsolution and a supersolution of the limit equation. Next note that for each $x\in A:=\{x\in X\mid H(x,0)=\sup_x H(x,0)\}$ the solution $u(t,x)+ct$ is non-increasing since $u_t+c\le 0$ and so $\overline{u}=\underline{u}$ on A by Dini's theorem. We see that $\overline{u}=\underline{u}$ by a comparison principle for the stationary equation. This means that $u(t,x)+ct$ converges to a solution $\overline{u}=\underline{u}$ of the stationary equation locally uniformly.

In order to justify this argument we will establish solvability of (1.3) and a comparison principle for Gangbo-Święch solutions of (1.3), which are new. The authors of [16] invoke a result by Lions-Papanicolaou-Varadhan [14]. The argument is based on the ergodic theory but in this work we will follow a direct approach via Perron method by Fathi-Siconolfi [7].

2. Definition of Gangbo-Święch solutions

In this section we review the definition of metric viscosity solutions proposed by Gangbo and Święch; see [8] and [9]. Let (X,d) be a complete geodesic metric space.

For a real-valued function u on an open subset Q of the spacetime $\mathbf{R}\times X$ define the *upper local slope* and *lower local slope*

$$|\nabla^+u|(t,x):=\limsup_{y\to x}\frac{[u(t,y)-u(t,x)]_+}{d(y,x)},$$
$$|\nabla^-u|(t,x):=\limsup_{y\to x}\frac{[u(t,y)-u(t,x)]_-}{d(y,x)}$$

and the *local slope*

$$|\nabla u|(t,x):=\limsup_{y\to x}\frac{|u(t,y)-u(t,x)|}{d(y,x)}.$$

It is easy to see that $|\nabla^-u|=|\nabla^+(-u)|$.

We next introduce smoothness classes for functions on a metric space.

Definition 2.1. We denote by $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ the set of all functions u on Q such that u is locally Lipschitz continuous on Q and $\partial_t u$ is continuous on Q. We also set

$$\overline{\mathcal{C}}^1(Q) := \{u \in \mathcal{C}(Q) \mid |\nabla^+ u| = |\nabla u| \text{ and they are continuous}\},$$
$$\underline{\mathcal{C}}^1(Q) := \{u \in \mathcal{C}(Q) \mid |\nabla^- u| = |\nabla u| \text{ and they are continuous}\}.$$

Lemma 2.2. *Let $u(t,x) := a(t)\phi(d(x,y)^2) + b(t)$ with $y \in X$, $\phi \in C^1(\mathbf{R}_+)$, $\phi' \geq 0$, $a, b \in C^1(\mathbf{R})$. Then, $u \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}^1(\mathbf{R} \times X)$ and moreover*

$$|\nabla^- u|(t,x) = |\nabla u|(t,x) = 2a(t)\phi'(d(x,y)^2)d(x,y).$$

See [1] or [8] for the proof.

We consider a Hamilton-Jacobi equation of the form

$$F(z, |Du|, \partial_t u) = 0 \quad \text{in } Q. \tag{2.1}$$

Here, $z = (t,x)$, and $F = F(z,p,q) \in C(Q \times \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R})$ is even and convex in p and strictly increasing in q. Set

$$F_r(z,p,q) := \begin{cases} \sup_{p' \in B} F(z, p + rp', q) & \text{if } r \geq 0 \\ \inf_{p' \in B} F(z, p + rp', q) & \text{if } r \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

for $r \in \mathbf{R}$, where $B := [-1,1]$. Note that $(z,p,q,r) \mapsto F_r(z,p,q)$ is continuous since $(z,p,q,r,p') \mapsto F(z, p+rp', q)$ is continuous and B is compact. Also, it is easy to check $r \mapsto F_r(z,p,q)$ is non-decreasing.

For a function u defined on Q with values in the extended real numbers $\bar{\mathbf{R}} := \mathbf{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$, we take its upper and lower semicontinuous envelope u^* and u_*.

Definition 2.3 (Metric viscosity solutions of (2.1))**.** Let u be an $\bar{\mathbf{R}}$-valued function on Q.

We say that u is a *metric viscosity subsolution* (resp. *supersolution*) of (2.1) when for every $\psi = \psi_1 + \psi_2$ with $\psi_1 \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}^1(Q)$ (resp. $\psi_1 \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}^1(Q)$) and $\psi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(Q)$, if $u^* - \psi$ (resp. $u_* - \psi$) attains a zero local maximum (resp. minimum) at a point $z = (t,x) \in Q$, i.e. $(u^* - \psi)(z) = \max_{B_R(z)}(u^* - \psi) = 0$ (resp. $(u_* - \psi)(z) = \min_{B_R(z)}(u_* - \psi) = 0$) for some $R > 0$, then

$$F_{-|\nabla \psi_2|^*(z)}(z, |\nabla \psi_1|(z), \partial_t \psi(z)) \leq 0 \text{ (resp. } F_{|\nabla \psi_2|^*(z)}(z, |\nabla \psi_1|(z), \partial_t \psi(z)) \geq 0.)$$

We say that u is a *metric viscosity solution* of (2.1) if u is both a metric viscosity subsolution and a metric viscosity supersolution of (2.1).

By a similar way we also define a notion of metric viscosity solutions for a stationary equation of the form

$$H(x, |Dv|) = 0 \quad \text{in } U \tag{2.2}$$

with $U \subset X$ open. Here, $H = H(x,p) \in C(U \times \mathbf{R})$ is even and convex in p. Note that one is able to define the local slopes $|\nabla^- v|$, $|\nabla^+ v|$, $|\nabla v|$ and smoothness $\mathcal{C}(U)$, $\overline{\mathcal{C}}^1(U)$, $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^1(U)$ for a function v on U.

Definition 2.4 (Metric viscosity solutions of (2.2))**.** Let v be an $\bar{\mathbf{R}}$-valued function on U.

We say that v is a *metric viscosity subsolution* (resp. *supersolution*) of (2.2) when for every $\psi = \psi_1 + \psi_2$ with $\psi_1 \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}^1(U)$ (resp. $\psi_1 \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}^1(U)$) and $\psi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(Q)$, if $v^* - \psi$

(resp. $v_* - \psi$) attains a zero local maximum (resp. minimum) at a point $x \in U$, then

$$H_{-|\nabla\psi_2|^*(x)}(x, |\nabla\psi_1|(x)) \le 0 \text{ (resp. } H_{|\nabla\psi_2|^*(x)}(x, |\nabla\psi_1|(x)) \ge 0.)$$

We say that v is a *metric viscosity solution* of (2.2) if v is both a metric viscosity subsolution and a metric viscosity supersolution of (2.2).

These notions satisfies the following natural propositions.

Proposition 2.5 (Consistency). *If u is a metric viscosity subsolution of (2.1) in $I \times U$ with an open interval I and u is of the form $u(t,x) = v(x)$, then v is a metric viscosity subsolution of (2.2) in U with $H(x,p) := F(0,x,p,0)$.*

Conversely, if v is a metric viscosity subsolution of (2.2) in U, then $u(t,x) := v(x)$ is a metric viscosity subsolution of (2.1) in $\mathbf{R} \times U$ with $F(t,x,p,a) := H(x,p)$.

Proposition 2.6 (Transitive relation). *Assume that $F = F(z,p,q)$, $G = G(z,p,q)$ satisfy $G \le F$ and let u be a metric viscosity subsolution of (2.1). Then, u is a metric viscosity subsolution of $G(z, |Du|, \partial_t u) = 0$ in Q.*

Proposition 2.7 (Locality). *Let Q_1 and Q_2 be two open subsets of $(0,\infty) \times X$. If u is a metric viscosity subsolution of (2.1) in Q_1 and is a metric viscosity subsolution of (2.1) in Q_2, then u is a metric viscosity subsolution of (2.1) in $Q = Q_1 \cup Q_2$*

Proposition 2.8 (Change of variable). *Let ϕ be a C^1 diffeomorphism from an interval I to an interval J. If u is a metric viscosity subsolution of (2.1) in $I \times U$, then $v(s,x) := u(\phi^{-1}(s), x)$ is a metric viscosity subsolution of*

$$F(x, |Dv|, \phi' v_s) = 0 \quad \text{in } J \times U.$$

Proposition 2.9 (Composition). *Let a be a non-zero constant and $b = b(t)$ be a C^1 function on an interval I. If u is a metric viscosity subsolution of (2.1) in $I \times U$, then $v(t,x) := au(t,x) + b(t)$ is a metric viscosity subsolution of*

$$F(x, \frac{|Dv|}{a}, \frac{v_t - b'(t)}{a}) = 0 \quad \text{in } I \times U.$$

Proposition 2.10 (Strong solutions). *Let $\psi_1 \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}^1(Q)$ and $\psi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(Q)$. If $\psi = \psi_1 + \psi_2$ satisfies*

$$F_{|\nabla\psi_2|^*(z)}(z, |\nabla\psi_1|(z), \partial_t\psi(z)) \le 0 \quad \text{for all } z \in Q,$$

then ψ is a metric viscosity subsolution of (2.1).

The proofs are straightforward so we omit them. For the proof of Proposition 2.10 see [9, Lemma 2.8].

3. Stability results

Let A be a topological space. For a family of functions $\{u(\cdot;a)\}_{a\in A}$ defined on Q take its upper and lower semicontinuous envelopes

$$u^*(z;a) := \limsup_{(z',a')\to(z,a)} u(z';a'), \quad u_*(z;a) := \liminf_{(z',a')\to(z,a)} u(z';a').$$

The functions $u^*(\cdot;a)$ and $u^*(\cdot;a)$ are respectively called the upper and lower semilimit of $\{u(\cdot;a)\}$ at $a \in A$. Also note that $u^*(\cdot;a)$ is upper semicontinuous and that for each (z,a) there exists a sequence (z_j, a_j) such that

$$(z_j, a_j, u(z_j;a_j)) \to (z, a, u^*(z;a)).$$

One of the main results of this section is:

Lemma 3.1 (Stability). *Let $F = F(z,p,q;a) \in C(Q \times \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} \times A)$ and let $u = u(\cdot;a)$ be a family of metric viscosity subsolutions (resp. supersolution) of* (2.1) *with $F = F(\cdot;a)$. Assume that $a \in A$ satisfies for each $z \in Q$*

(3.1)
$$\limsup_{a' \to a} \sup_{B_r(z)} u(\cdot;a') \le \sup_{B_r(z)} u^*(\cdot;a) \text{ (resp. } \liminf_{a' \to a} \inf_{B_r(z)} u(\cdot;a') \le \inf_{B_r(z)} u_*(\cdot;a))$$

for all $r > 0$ small enough. Then, the upper (resp. lower) semilimit $\overline{u} := u^*(\cdot,a)$ (resp. $\underline{u} := u^*(\cdot,a)$) is a metric viscosity subsolution (resp. supersolution) of (2.1) *with $F = F(\cdot;a)$.*

Remark 3.2. An sufficient condition of the assumption (3.1) is that the metric space X is locally compact. Indeed, since $B := \overline{B}_r(z)$ is compact for small r, we are able to take a sequence of maximum points $z_{a'}$ of $u(\cdot;a')$ and assume that $z_{a'}$ converges to some $\bar{z} \in B$ as $a' \to a$ by taking a subsequence if necessary. Then,

$$\limsup_{a' \to a} \sup_{B} u(\cdot;a') = \limsup_{a' \to a} u(z_{a'};a') \le u^*(\bar{z};a) \le \sup_{B} u^*(\cdot;a).$$

We also point out that if the assumption is removed, then the lemma may be false in general; see [11].

A direct consequence of Lemma 3.1 is:

Corollary 3.3 (Stability under extremum). *Let $F = F(z,p,q) \in C(Q \times \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R})$. Let S be a family of metric viscosity subsolutions (resp. supersolutions) of* (2.1). *Then $\overline{u}(z) := \sup_{v \in \mathcal{S}} v(z)$ (resp. $\underline{u}(z) := \inf_{v \in \mathcal{S}} v(z)$) is a metric viscosity subsolution (resp. supersolutions) of* (2.1).

Proof. Set $A = S$ with the indiscrete topology and trivial families $\{F\}_{v \in S}$ and $\{U(\cdot;v) = v\}_{v \in S}$. Note that $U^*(z;v) = u^*(z)$ and $\limsup_{v' \to v} \sup_{B_r(z)} U(\cdot;v') = \sup_{B_r(z)} U^*(\cdot;v) = \sup_{B_r(z)} u^*$. Therefore, by applying Lemma 3.1 we see that u is a metric viscosity subsolution of (2.1). □

Our proof of Lemma 3.1 is inspired by [8]. First recall Ekeland's variational principle of a classical version [4], [5].

Lemma 3.4 (Ekeland's variational principle). *Let (X,d) be a complete metric space and let $F\colon X \to \bar{\mathbf{R}}$ be a upper semicontinuous function bounded from above (resp. below) satisfying $D(F) := \{F > -\infty\}$ (resp. $D(F) := \{F < +\infty\}$) is not empty. Then, for each $\hat{x} \in D(F)$, there exists $\bar{x} \in X$ such that $d(\hat{x},\bar{x}) \le 1$, $F(\bar{x}) \ge F(\hat{x})$ (resp. $F(\bar{x}) \le F(\hat{x})$) and $x \to F(x) - md(\bar{x},x)$ attains a strict maximum (resp. minimum) at $\bar{x}$ with $m := \sup F - F(\hat{x})$ (resp. $m := \inf F - F(\hat{x})$).*

See [5] for the proof.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Fix $\psi = \psi_1 + \psi_2$ with $\psi_1 \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}^1(Q)$ and $\psi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(Q)$ such that $\overline{u} - \psi$ attains a zero maximum at $\hat{z} = (\hat{t},\hat{x})$ over $\overline{B}_R(\hat{z}) \subset Q$ with some $R > 0$, i.e.

$$(\overline{u} - \psi)(\hat{z}) = \sup_{\overline{B}_R(\hat{z})} (\overline{u} - \psi) = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

Set $\tilde{\psi}_2(z) := \psi_2(z) + d(\hat{x},x)^2 + (t - \hat{t})^2$ with $z = (t,x)$ and $\tilde{\psi} = \psi_1 + \tilde{\psi}_2$.

Take a subsequence $a_j \to a$ and a sequence of points $z_j = (t_j,x_j) \in \overline{B}_R(\hat{z})$ such that $z_j \to \hat{z}$ and $u_j(z_j) = u(z_j;a_j) \to \overline{u}(\hat{z}) = u^*(\hat{z};a)$, where $u_j := u(\cdot;a_j)$. We see

by Ekeland's variational principle (Lemma 3.4) that there exists $w_j = (s_j, y_j) \in \overline{B}_R(\hat{z})$ such that $z = (t, x) \mapsto ((u_j)^* - \tilde{\psi})(z) - m_j d(y_j, x)$ attains maximum at w_j over $\overline{B}_R(\hat{z})$ with

$$m_j := \sup_{\overline{B}_R(\hat{z})} ((u_j)^* - \tilde{\psi}) - ((u_j)^* - \tilde{\psi})(z_j) \geq 0$$

Note that

$$\limsup_{j\to\infty} m_j = \limsup_{j\to\infty} \sup_{\overline{B}_R(\hat{z})} ((u_j)^* - \tilde{\psi}) - (\overline{u} - \tilde{\psi})(\hat{z})$$

and so $m_j \to 0$ by the assumptions (3.1) and (3.2). We also observe that

$$((u_j)^* - \tilde{\psi})(w_j) \geq (u_j - \tilde{\psi})(z_j) - m_j d(y_j, x_j) \geq (u_j - \tilde{\psi})(z_j) - 2Rm_j$$

and that the last term converges to $(\overline{u} - \tilde{\psi})(\hat{z})$ as $j \to \infty$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{j\to\infty} d(\hat{x}, y_j)^2 + (s_j - \hat{t})^2 &\leq \limsup_{j\to\infty}((u_j)^* - \psi)(w_j) - (\overline{u} - \tilde{\psi})(\hat{z}) \\ &\leq \limsup_{j\to\infty} \sup_{\overline{B}_R(\hat{z})} ((u_j)^* - \psi) - (\overline{u} - \tilde{\psi})(\hat{z})\end{aligned}$$

and it follows from (3.1) and (3.2) that $w_j = (s_j, y_j) \to \hat{z} = (\hat{t}, \hat{x})$.

Now, since u_j is a metric viscosity subsolution,

$$F_{-r_j}(w_j, |\nabla\psi_1|(w_j), \partial_t\tilde{\psi}(w_j); a_j) \leq 0.$$

Here, r_j is some non-negative number such that

$$r_j \leq |\nabla\psi_2|^*(w_j) + m_j + 2d(\hat{x}, y_j) + 2|s_j - \hat{t}|$$

and so $\limsup r_j \leq |\nabla\psi_2|^*(\hat{z})$. Since $(z, p, q, r; a) \to F_r(z, p, q; a)$ is continuous and $r \to F_r(z, p, q; a)$ is non-decreasing, we see that

$$F_{-|\nabla\psi_2|^*(\hat{z})}(\hat{z}, |\nabla\psi_1|(\hat{z}), \partial_t\psi(\hat{z}); a) \leq 0.$$

Therefore, u is a subsolution. □

Another goal of this section is a principle to construct a metric viscosity solution by the Perron method.

Proposition 3.5 (Perron method)**.** *Let $F = F(z, p, q) \in C(Q \times \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R})$ and let g be an $\bar{\mathbf{R}}$-valued function on ∂Q. Let $\mathcal{S}$ denote the set of all metric viscosity subsolutions (resp. supersolution) v of* (2.1) *satisfying $v^* \leq g$ (resp. $v_* \leq g$) on ∂Q. Then, $u(z) := \sup_{v\in\mathcal{S}} v(z)$ (resp. $u(z) := \inf_{v\in\mathcal{S}} v(z)$) is a metric viscosity solution of* (2.1)*.*

Perron method for construction of a viscosity solution to Hamilton-Jacobi equations was first presented by H. Ishii [13]. Actually, the authors of [8] have already established a similar result for metric viscosity solutions ([8, Theorem 7.6]). However, let us give a proof since we have slightly improved the result to apply it directly to construction of a solution of the limit equation (1.3). We remark that the function

$$\overline{u}(x) := \begin{cases} +\infty & \text{if } x \in Q \\ g(x) & \text{if } x \in \partial Q \end{cases}$$

is a supersolution of (2.1).

Proof. We only show that u is a supersolution since being a subsolution is due to Corollary 3.3. Fix $\psi = \psi_1 + \psi_2$ with $\psi_1 \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}^1(Q)$ and $\psi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(Q)$ such that $u_* - \psi$ attains a zero minimum at $\hat{z} := (\hat{t}, \hat{x})$ over $\overline{B}_R(\hat{z}) \subset Q$ with some $R > 0$. Set $\tilde{\psi}_2(z) := \psi_2(z) - d(\hat{z}, z)^2$ and $\tilde{\psi} = \psi_1 + \tilde{\psi}_2$. Suppose by contradiction that

$$F_{|\nabla\psi_2|^*(\hat{z})}(\hat{z}, |\nabla\psi_1|(\hat{z}), \partial_t\psi(\hat{z})) < 0.$$

Since $(z, p, q, r) \mapsto F_r(z, p, q)$ is continuous and $r \mapsto F_r(z, p, q)$ is non-decreasing, we may assume that $\tilde{\psi} = \psi_1 + \tilde{\psi}_2$ is a subsolution of

$$F_{|\nabla\tilde{\psi}_2|^*(z)}(z, |\nabla\psi_1|(z), \partial_t\tilde{\psi}(z)) \le 0 \quad \text{for all } z \in B_R(\hat{z})$$

by taking R small enough. Recalling Proposition 2.10, we see that $\tilde{\psi}$ is a metric viscosity subsolution of (2.1) in $B_R(\hat{z})$. Now observe that

$$(u - \tilde{\psi})(z) \ge (u_* - \tilde{\psi})(z) \ge d(\hat{z}, z)^2 \ge \frac{R^2}{4} =: m > 0$$

for all $z \in \overline{B}_R(\hat{z}) \setminus B_{R/2}(\hat{z})$. Construct a new function

$$w(z) = \begin{cases} \max\{\tilde{\psi}(z) + m/2, u(z)\} & \text{if } z \in B_R(\hat{z}), \\ u(z) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, w is equal to u on $Q \setminus B_{R/2}(\hat{z})$ and so it is a subsolution of (2.1) in $Q \setminus B_{R/2}(\hat{z})$. It follows from Proposition 2.9 and Corollary 3.3 that w is a subsolution of (2.1) in $B_R(\hat{z})$. Therefore, Proposition 2.7 shows that w is a subsolution of (2.1) in Q and so $w \in \mathcal{S}$. In particular, $u(\hat{z}) \ge w(\hat{z})$ but $w(\hat{z}) = \psi(\hat{z}) + m/2 = u(\hat{z}) + m/2$. Since $m > 0$, we obtain a contradiction and conclude that u is a supersolution. □

4. Application to large time behavior

We study large time asymptotic behaviors of solutions of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.2) with a Hamiltonian H satisfying (A1)–(A4) on a compact geodesic metric space (X, d). First note uniqueness of the constant c such that (1.3) admits a solution.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume (A1), (A2) and that X is compact. Let $c \in \mathbf{R}$ be a constant such that* (1.3) *admits a real-valued continuous solution. Then,*

$$c = \max_{x \in X} H(x, 0). \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. By the assumption (A2) it is enough to show that

$$\sup_{x \in X} \inf_{p \in \mathbf{R}_+} H(x, p) \le c \le \sup_{x \in X} H(x, 0). \tag{4.2}$$

It is easy to show the second inequality of (4.2). Indeed, since a solution v attains a minimum at some point $\hat{x} \in X$, we have $H_0(\hat{x}, 0) = H(\hat{x}, 0) \ge c$, which implies $\sup_{x \in X} H(x, 0) \ge c$. In order to prove the first inequality of (4.2), fix $\hat{x} \in X$. Let us consider the function $v(x) - nd(x, \hat{x})^2/2$ and take its maximum point x_n for each $n = 0, \cdots$. Now, since $v(x_n) - nd(x_n, \hat{x})^2/2 \ge v(\hat{x})$, we have $d(x_n, \hat{x})^2 \le 2(\max v - v(\hat{x}))/n$. Therefore, $x_n \to \hat{x}$ as $n \to \infty$. Since u is a subsolution, $H_0(x_n, nd(x_n, \hat{x})) = H(x_n, nd(x_n, \hat{x})) \le c$. Hence, $\inf_{p \in \mathbf{R}_+} H(x_n, p) \le c$ and sending $n \to \infty$ yields $\inf_{p \in \mathbf{R}_+} H(\hat{x}, p) \le c$. We now obtained the inequalities (4.2). □

Remark 4.2. It is a problem whether the inequalities (4.2) holds even if we remove the compactness assumption. One can show them by a similar argument to the proofs in Section 3 using Ekeland's variational principle provided $p \mapsto \sup_{x\in X} H(x,p)$ is continuous.

In view of this proposition we hereafter define c by (4.1). Now we are able to state the main theorem of large time behavior.

Theorem 4.3 (Large time behavior)**.** *Assume (A1)–(A4), $u_0 \in Lip(X)$ and that X is compact. Let u be a Lipschitz continuous solution of* (1.2) *with* (**??**) *on $[0,\infty)\times X$. Then, $u(t,x)+ct$ converges to a function v locally uniformly as $t\to\infty$ in X and v is a solution of* (1.3)*.*

In order to prove this theorem we first establish regularity, existence and comparison results for the stationary equation (1.3). Set

$$A := \{x \in X \mid H(x,0) = c\}.$$

Proposition 4.4 (Lipschitz continuity of solutions of (1.3))**.** *Assume (A1), (A3) and (A4). Then, real-valued continuous solutions of* (1.3) *are equi-Lipschitz continuous.*

Proof. Note that there exists a constant $L \in \mathbf{R}_+$ such that $H(x,p) \geq c$ for all $x \in X$ and $p \geq L$ by (A3). Fix a real-valued continuous solution v. Consider the function $v(x) - v(y) - 2L\sqrt{d(x,y)^2+\varepsilon^2}$ for $x, y \in X$ and take its maximum point x_ε with respect to x for each $\varepsilon > 0$. Note that $x \mapsto v(y) + 2L\sqrt{d(x,y)^2+\varepsilon^2}$ is of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^1(X)$ by Lemma 2.2. Hence, we see that

$$H_0\left(x_\varepsilon, \frac{2Ld(x_\varepsilon,y)}{\sqrt{d(x_\varepsilon,y)^2+\varepsilon^2}}\right) = H\left(x_\varepsilon, \frac{2Ld(x_\varepsilon,y)}{\sqrt{d(x_\varepsilon,y)^2+\varepsilon^2}}\right) \leq c.$$

Therefore, we see that $2Ld(x_\varepsilon,y)/\sqrt{d(x_\varepsilon,y)^2+\varepsilon^2} \leq L$ and so $x_\varepsilon \to y$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Now, for each $x, y \in X$, we have

$$v(x) - v(y) - 2L\sqrt{d(x,y)^2+\varepsilon^2} \leq v(x_\varepsilon) - v(y) - 2L\sqrt{d(x_\varepsilon,y)^2+\varepsilon^2}$$

Sending $\varepsilon \to 0$ yields

$$v(x) - v(y) - 2Ld(x,y) \leq 0,$$

which means that all subsolutions of (1.3) is $2L$-Lipschitz continuous. □

Theorem 4.5 (Existence of a solution of (1.3))**.** *Assume (A1), (A3) and (A4). Then, there exists at least one Lipschitz continuous solution of* (1.3) *whenever A is non-empty.*

Proof. Define

$$S(x,y) := \sup\{w(x) \mid w \in C(X) \text{ is a subsolution of (1.3) with } w(y) = 0\}.$$

Note that the constant $w \equiv 0$ is a subsolution of (1.3). Also Proposition 4.4 ensures that the solutions of (1.3) are equi-Lipschitz continuous and hence $v := S(\cdot, y)$ is a Lipschitz continuous function on X. Now, Corollary 3.3 implies that v is a subsolution of (1.3) in X while Proposition 3.5 shows that v is a supersolution of (1.3) in $X \setminus \{y\}$. Since $H(x,p) \geq H(x,0) = c$ for $x \in A$, we see that $v = S(\cdot, y)$ is a solution for every $y \in A \neq \emptyset$. □

Theorem 4.6 (Comparison principle for (2.2))**.** *Let U be an open subset of X such that $\overline{U}$ is compact. Assume (A1), (A2) and that $H(x,0) < 0$ for all $x \in U$. Let u be a subsolution and v be a supersolution of (2.2) such that $u^* < +\infty$ and $v_* > -\infty$. If $u^* \le v_*$ on ∂U, then $u^* \le v_*$ in U.*

Proof. First note that we may assume $u^*(x_0) \neq -\infty$ and $v_*(x_0) \neq +\infty$ at some $x_0 \in U$; otherwise the conclusion holds. Fix $\theta \in (0,1)$ and consider the upper semicontinuous function defined by

$$\Phi(x,y) := \theta u^*(x) - v_*(y) - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} d(x,y)^2$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$. Thanks to the compactness of $\overline{U}$, we are able to take a maximum point $(x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon) \in \overline{U} \times \overline{U}$ of Φ. It follows from $\Phi(x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon) \ge \Phi(x_0, x_0)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2\varepsilon} d(x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon)^2 &\le \theta u^*(x_\varepsilon) - v_*(y_\varepsilon) - \theta u^*(x_0) + v_*(x_0) \\ &\le \theta \sup u^* - \inf u_* - \theta u^*(x_0) + v_*(x_0) < +\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $d(x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon) \to 0$ and so we may assume that x_ε and y_ε converge to a same point $\bar{x} \in \overline{U}$ by taking a subsequence. Let us consider the case when $\bar{x} \in U$. Then, since u and v are a subsolution and a supersolution,

$$\begin{aligned}H(x_\varepsilon, \frac{1}{\theta\varepsilon} d(x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon)) &\le 0, \\ H(y_\varepsilon, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} d(x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon)) &\ge 0.\end{aligned}$$

By the convexity of H the second inequality yields

$$(1-\theta) H(y_\varepsilon, 0) + \theta H(y_\varepsilon, \frac{1}{\theta\varepsilon} d(x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon)) \ge 0$$

Hence,

$$(1-\theta) H(y_\varepsilon, 0) + \theta H(y_\varepsilon, \frac{1}{\theta\varepsilon} d(x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon)) - \theta H(x_\varepsilon, \frac{1}{\theta\varepsilon} d(x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon)) \ge 0.$$

Sending $\varepsilon \to 0$ yields $(1-\theta) H(\bar{x}, 0) \ge 0$. Since $H(\bar{x}, 0) < 0$ and $\theta < 1$, we obtain a contradiction. Therefore, $\bar{x} \in \partial U$. We now observe that

$$\theta u^*(x_\varepsilon) - v_*(y_\varepsilon) \ge \Phi(x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon) \ge \sup_{x \in U} \Phi(x,x) = \sup_U (\theta u^* - v_*).$$

Hence, we see that $\sup_U (\theta u^* - v_*) \le (\theta u^* - v_*)(\bar{x}) \le \sup_{\partial U} (\theta u^* - v_*)$. Sending $k \to 1$ implies $\sup_U (u^* - v_*) \le \sup_{\partial U} (u^* - v_*)$. □

Corollary 4.7 (Comparison principle for (1.3))**.** *Assume that X is compact. Let u be a subsolution and v be a supersolution of (1.3) such that $u^* < +\infty$ and $v_* > -\infty$. If $u^* \le v_*$ on A, then $u^* \le v_*$ on X.*

Proof. It follows from the definition of A that $H(x,0) - c < 0$ for all $x \in U := X \setminus A$. Therefore, Theorem 4.6 implies $u^* \le v_*$ in $X \setminus A$. □

We will also require a comparison principle for the evolution equation (1.2).

Theorem 4.8 (Comparison principle for (1.2))**.** *Assume (A1) and that X is compact. Let u be a subsolution and v be a supersolution of (1.2) such that $u^* < +\infty$ and $v_* > -\infty$. If $u^*|_{t=0} \le v_*|_{t=0}$, then $u^* \le v_*$ on $(0,\infty) \times X$.*

One is able to prove this theorem with the same idea as in [9, Proof of Proposition 3.3] and so we omit the proof.

Before starting the proof of Theorem 4.3, let us explain that the initial value problem (1.2), (**??**) admits a unique Lipschitz continuous solution. We will construct a solution by Perron method while the uniqueness is a direct consequence of the comparison principle (Theorem 4.8). Let $\mathrm{Lip}[u_0]$ denote the Lipschitz constant of u_0 and set $K = \max_{x\in X} |H(x, \mathrm{Lip}[u_0])|$. First note that $\overline{u}(t,x) := u_0(x) + Kt$ and $\underline{u}(t,x) := u_0(x) - Kt$ are a Lipschitz continuous supersolution and subsolution on $[0,\infty) \times X$, respectively. We then can construct a continuous solution u such that $\underline{u} \le \overline{u}$ by using Proposition 3.5 and Theorem 4.8. Take a constant $L \in \mathbf{R}_+$ such that $H(x,p) \ge c$ for all $x \in X$ and $p \ge L$. Then, we see that $|u(t,x) - u(s,y)| \le K|t-s| + Ld(x,y)$ by a similar argument to the proof of Propositiont:liplhj. Actually, this is a standard argument and we refer the reader to [10].

We are now able to prove the main theorem stated at the top of this section.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Take the solution v_0 of (1.3) in Theorem 4.5. Noting that u_0 and v_0 are bounded since X is compact, we are also able to see that $v_0 - M \le u_0 \le v_0 + M$ for some large $M > 0$. Recall Propositions 2.5 and 2.9, which imply that $v_0 - ct \pm M$ are solutions of (1.2). We then see by a comparison principle for (1.2) (Theorem 4.8) that $v_0 - ct - M \le u \le v_0 - ct + M$. Thus, the upper and lower semi-limits

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{v}(x) &:= \sup_{(t_j,x_j)\to(\infty,x)} \limsup_j \{u(t_j,x_j) + ct_j\},\\
\underline{v}(x) &:= \inf_{(t_j,x_j)\to(\infty,x)} \liminf_j \{u(t_j,x_j) + ct_j\}
\end{aligned}$$

can be defined as a bounded function on X since $v_0 - M \le \underline{v} \le \overline{v} \le v_0 + M$.

We next note that Propositions 2.8 and 2.9 show the function

$$w^\lambda(t,x) := u\left(\frac{t}{\lambda}, x\right) + c\frac{t}{\lambda}$$

is a solution of

$$\lambda \partial_t w^\lambda + H(x, |Dw^\lambda|) = c \quad \text{in } (0,\infty)\times X \tag{4.3}$$

for each $\lambda > 0$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{v}(x) &= \sup_{(t_j,x_j,\lambda_j)\to(t,x,0)} \limsup_j w^{\lambda_j}(t_j,x_j),\\
\underline{v}(x) &= \inf_{(t_j,x_j,\lambda_j)\to(t,x,0)} \liminf_j w^{\lambda_j}(t_j,x_j)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t > 0$ and $x \in X$, i.e. $\overline{v}$ and $\underline{v}$ are respectively nothing but the upper and lower semilimit of w^λ as $\lambda \to 0$, the stability result (Proposition 3.1) and Proposition 2.5 shows that $\overline{v}$ and $\underline{v}$ are a subsolution and a supersolution of (1.3), respectively.

We next claim that $\overline{v} = \underline{v}$ on the set A. Indeed, for each $x \in A$, $u(t,x) + ct$ converges to some $v(x)$ since $\partial_t u + c \le 0$ and so it is a decreasing sequence. We also obtain that u is equi-Lipschitz continuous. By connecting these two facts, we see that $\overline{v} \le v \le \underline{v}$ on A.

Finally, the comparison principle (Theorem 4.7) shows that $\overline{v} \le \underline{v}$ on the whole space X. Thus, we can conclude that $u(t,x) + ct$ converges to some function $v = \overline{v} = \underline{v}$ which is a solution of (1.3). □

Remark 4.9. The convexity assumption (A2) is used only to guarantee a comparison principle holds for the stationary equation (1.3). It is possible to weaken the condition. For instance, let us consider the specific Hamiltonian $H(x,p) = \sqrt{|p|}$, which is not convex. One easily see that the equation (1.3) is equivalent to $|Dv| = c^2$. Since a comparison principle for the convex Hamiltonian $|Dv| = c^2$ implies a comparison principle $\sqrt{|Dv|} = c$, the same behavior of the solution must occur to the Hamiltonian $H(x,p) = \sqrt{|p|}$. This scheme works for quasiconvex Hamiltonians $H(x,p) = h(|p|) + f(x)$ with $h\colon \mathbf{R}_+ \to \mathbf{R}$ such that $h(p) - \lambda p$ is non-decreasing for some $\lambda > 0$.

Let us introduce the functions $\phi_-, \phi_\infty \in C(X)$ by

$$\phi_-(x) := \inf_{t\geq 0}(u(x,t) + ct),$$
$$\phi_\infty(x) := \min\{S(x,y) + \phi_-(y) \mid y \in A\},$$

where the function S is defined in the proof of Theorem 4.5.

Proposition 4.10. *Let $u \in C([0,\infty) \times X)$ be a solution of (1.2). Then ϕ_- and ϕ_∞ are solutions of (1.3).*

Proof. Note that $u(x,t) + ct$ is supersolution of (1.3). Thus, by Corollary 3.3 and Proposition 3.5, which can be proved similarly for (1.3) as well, we immediately see that ϕ_- is solution of (1.3). Since S is solution of (1.3) as we showed in the proof of Theorem 4.5, applying Corollary 3.3 and Proposition 3.5 again implies that ϕ_∞ is solution of (1.3). □

Theorem 4.11 (Asymptotic profile)**.** *We have*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}(u(x,t) + ct) = \phi_\infty(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in X. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. Denote the left-hand side of (4.4) by $u_\infty(x)$. Since

$$\phi_-(x) \leq u(x,t) + ct \quad \text{for all } (x,t) \in X \times [0,\infty),$$

it follows that $\phi_- \leq u_\infty$ in X. It also can be seen that $\phi_\infty \leq \phi_-$ on $\mathcal{A}$ and thus we have $\phi_\infty \leq u_\infty$ on $\mathcal{A}$ from above two inequalities. This fact and Theorem 4.7 leads us to the relationship that $\phi_\infty \leq u_\infty$ on X.

We shall show the other inequality. In order to do, set $v(x,t) := \inf_{s\geq t}(u(x,s) + cs)$ and then we can easily see $v(x,0) = \phi_-(x)$. Since $\phi_\infty = \phi_-$ on A, Corollary 4.7 implies that $\phi_\infty \geq \phi_- = v(\cdot,0)$ on X. It can be considered that ϕ_∞ as a solution of (1.2) with $\phi_\infty \geq u_0$ and thus by Theorem 4.8 we obtain $v(x,t) \leq \phi_\infty(x)$ for all $x \in X$ and $t \geq 0$. Sending $t \to \infty$ yields $u_\infty \leq \phi_\infty$ on X. □

References

[1] L. Ambrosio and J. Feng, *On a class of first order Hamilton-Jacobi equations in metric spaces*, J. Differential Equations **256** (2014), no. 7, 2194–2245.

[2] G. Barles and B. Perthame, *Discontinuous solutions of deterministic optimal stopping time problems*, RAIRO Modél. Math. Anal. Numér. **21** (1987), no. 4, 557–579.

[3] F. Camilli, R. Capitanelli and C. Marchi, *Eikonal equations on the Sierpinski gasket*, preprint.

[4] I. Ekeland, *On the variational principle*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **47** (1974), 324–353.

[5] I. Ekeland, *Nonconvex minimization problems*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **1** (1979), no. 3, 443–474.

[6] A. Fathi, *Sur la convergence du semi-groupe de Lax-Oleinik*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sr. I Math. **327** (1998), no. 3, 267–270.

[7] A. Fathi and A. Siconolfi, *PDE aspects of Aubry-Mather theory for quasiconvex Hamiltonians*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **22** (2005), no. 2, 185-228.
[8] W. Gangbo and A. Święch, *Optimal transport and large number of particles*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **34** (2014), no. 4, 1397–1441.
[9] W. Gangbo and A. Święch, *Metric viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, preprint.
[10] Y. Giga, N. Hamamuki, *Hamilton-Jacobi equations with discontinuous source terms*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **38** (2013), no. 2, 199-243.
[11] Y. Giga, N. Hamamuki and A. Nakayasu, *Eikonal equations in metric spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. to appear.
[12] Y. Giga, Q. Liu and H. Mitake, *Singular Neumann problem and large-time behaviour of solutions of noncoercive Hamilton-Jacobi equations* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **366** (2013), 1905–1941.
[13] H. Ishii, *Perrons method for Hamilton-Jacobi equations* Duke Math. J. **55** (1987), no. 2, 369-384.
[14] P.-L. Lions, G. C. Papanicolaou and S. R. S. Varadhan, *Homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, unpublished.
[15] A. Nakayasu, *On metric viscosity solutions for Hamilton-Jacobi equations of evolution type*, preprint.
[16] G., Namah and J.-M. Roquejoffre, *Remarks on the long time behaviour of the solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **24** (1999), no. 5–6, 883-893.
[17] D., Schieborn and F. Camilli, *Viscosity solutions of Eikonal equations on topological networks*, preprint.

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro, Tokyo, 153-8914 Japan
E-mail address: ankys@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro, Tokyo, 153-8914 Japan
E-mail address: namba@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp